REMARKS

On February 1, 2008, the applicant filed a response with an RCE. The following is a supplemental response to the in-person interview conducted on February 28, 2008. Any amendments and comments discussed during said interview, conducted between examiner Truc T. Chuong, his supervising examiner, Matt Dyor, and the undersigned, are incorporated into the below remarks.

Turning to representative claim 1, it recites:

> 1. A single computer system for running one or more software applications, wherein the software applications are suitable for generating a video output, the computer system comprising:
>
> a host operating system suitable for displaying a graphical user interface;
> ***multiple guest operating systems running on the single computer system*** in virtual machines emulated by one or more emulator programs running on the host operating system; and
> wherein the host operating system is able to display a reduced-size continually updated representation of the video output of at least one operating system from the multiple guest operating systems that are being operated in a background mode.

(emphasis added) (*see* Fig. 2). In contrast, Webb et al. does not teach such multiple guest operating systems running on a single host computer 11. In fact, in the office action, the examiner has construed each printer as having its own operating system: "multiple printers with their operating systems…" (pp. 2-3). Thus, if each printer has its own operating system, and the printers are separate from the host computer 11 (Fig. 1), then it necessarily follows that Webb et al. cannot disclose "multiple guest operating systems running on the single computer system" (claim 1). This point was made during the in-person interview, and the applicant stresses it further by amending the claims in order to more clearly point out the recited subject matter. Thus, claim 1 patentably defines over the cited art.

Independent claims 8, 11, 12, 21, 23, 30, and 33 recite similar subject matter to that of claim 1. Moreover, in so far as the dependent claims incorporate elements from their respective independent claims, they also patentably define over the cited art at least for similar reasons. Thus, the applicant submits that all the pending claims, 1-16 and claims 18-34, define over the cited art and are in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, claim 1 was amended to recite that representations of the video output are "continually updated" (for support, *see* Specification, at p. 14, l. 16). This amendment patentably defines over the cited art that at most discloses "static" images of printers (Fig. 8).

As a side note, during the interview, a discussion began regarding the difference between "running" and "executing." To this end, the applicant notes that according to at least one online resource, *Webopedia.com* ("The #1 online encyclopedia dedicated to computer technology"), to **run** can include to **execute** (see www.webopedia.com/TERM/run.html). The notion of "running" in the present application at least may include the notion of "executing" (albeit in other respects "running" may encompass a different claim scope). Thus, the recited "running" clarifies any issues as to whether guest operating systems are "executing." *See Also* claim 23: "wherein both guest operating systems are configured for concurrent **execution** on the host computer" (emphasis added); and, claim 12: "multiple guest computer systems in virtual machine environments and **executing** on a **single** computer system" (emphasis added).

Should the examiner have any questions or concerns, the undersigned can be contacted at 206-903-2461.

Date: March 26, 2008   / Grzegorz S. Plichta /
                                          Grzegorz S. Plichta
                                          Registration No. 55,541

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439